

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 and 15-26 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 15, 18, 20-23 and 25-26 are amended. Various amendments are made to the claims for clarity and are unrelated to issues of patentability.

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 because the amendments: a) place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth below; b) do not raise any new issues that require further search and/or consideration; and c) place the application in better form for an appeal should an appeal be necessary. More specifically, the above amendments merely clarify previously claimed subject matter. No new issues are raised. Thus, entry is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116.

The Office Action objects to claim 20. The above amendment to claim 20 obviates the grounds for objection. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully submitted.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-13 and 15-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent 5,929,849 to Kikinis in view of the "BMW Website." The Office Action also rejects claims 20, 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by Kikinis. The Office Action also rejects claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent 6,202,212 to Sturgeon et al. (hereafter Sturgeon) in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0059241 to Van Ryzin. The Office Action also rejects claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sturgeon in view of Van Ryzin and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,212,371 to Boles et al. (hereafter Boles). Finally, the Office Action rejects claims 10-13, 15-18 and 20-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sturgeon in view of U.S. Patent 6,542,897 to Lee. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1

Independent claim 1 recites a storing unit for storing proper information of the TV and contact information of an Internet site. Independent claim 1 also recites a controlling unit to access information from the Internet site using the stored proper information of the TV in response to an action of a user, the controlling unit further displaying function information and feature information of the TV on a screen by using the stored contact information and the stored proper information.

The Office Action asserts that Kikinis teaches a storing unit for storing proper information of a product and contact information of an Internet site. However, Kikinis merely discloses that a TV transmission may contain a dynamic URL. See col. 8, lines 61-64 and col. 9, lines 24-27. Kikinis accesses the URL based on an image on the TV. However, Kikinis does not disclose a TV that includes a storing unit and a controlling unit in which the storing unit for storing proper information of the TV. Kikinis also has no suggestion for storing proper information of a TV since Kikinis merely relates to a data stream that may contain a dynamic URL and for accessing information based on features displayed on a TV. For example, Figure 2 of Kikinis shows a screen having an automobile (within an advertisement). The URL for a BMW link may be provided within the data stream of a TV transmission. Kikinis has no suggestion for storing proper information of the TV in which the TV includes the claimed storing unit and controlling unit.

Furthermore, the BMW Website does not teach or suggest the missing features of independent claim 1. That is, the BMW Website is merely cited to show alleged function

information or feature information. However, the BMW Website does not teach or suggest function information or feature information of the TV (in which the TV includes both the claimed storing unit and the claimed controlling unit). Accordingly, Kikinis and the BMW Website do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1.

Sturgeon discloses a display unit capable of acting as a computer monitor in one mode and as a television unit in another mode. See Sturgeon's col. 4, lines 19-24. However, Sturgeon does not teach or suggest a TV that includes a storing unit and a controlling unit where the storing unit for storing proper information of the TV and contact information of an Internet site. Furthermore, Sturgeon does not teach or suggest displaying function information and feature information of the TV on a screen by using the stored contact information and the stored proper information.

The Office Action asserts (on page 11, last three lines) that Sturgeon does not disclose PC functionality for a particular retrieval of product related information from the Internet. The Office Action then relies on Van Ryzin for the missing features. In particular, the Office Action appears to cite Van Ryzin's UPC code for the alleged stored proper information of a product and contact information of an Internet site. However, applicants respectfully submit that Sturgeon and Van Ryzin may not be combined as alleged in the Office Action, and even if combined, still do not teach or suggest these features.

Van Ryzin relates to a computer system that may utilize a UPC symbol to obtain information such as user manuals from the Internet. Van Ryzin has no suggestion for a TV that includes a storing unit and a controlling unit in which the storing unit for storing proper

information of the TV. Rather, Van Ryzin merely describes that a UPC code may be used in a computer system to scan a product bar code 20, transmit the product code 40 to a server base station 30 and retrieve an Internet product page address therefrom. Merely because Van Ryzin discloses accessing an Internet web page, there is no suggestion that Van Ryzin's system may be provided within a TV system. Rather, the only suggestion for this combination is provided in applicants' own specification. Therefore the combination is based on impermissible hindsight.

Further, the Office Action appears to state that various computer functionality may be provided within a TV. However, there is no basis for this general concept. The Office Action's motivation for the alleged combination is based on impermissible hindsight and the rejection should be withdrawn for this reason.

Furthermore, Van Ryzin has no suggestion for scanning a UPC code on Sturgeon's apparatus. There is no suggestion that Sturgeon's display unit even includes a UPC code. The Office Action makes a combination of Sturgeon and Van Ryzin apparently because both references mention an optical scanner. However, Sturgeon merely describes an optical scanner with regard to the multimedia capabilities. See Sturgeon's col. 4, lines 1-12. This differs from Van Ryzin's scanner for UPC codes. There is no suggestion that Van Ryzin may be combined with Sturgeon merely because the word "optical scanner" appears within Sturgeon. There also is no suggestion for modifying Sturgeon's system so as to include an optical scanner for scanning bar codes and accessing server databases so as to access Internet web pages. Further, even if combined, applicants respectfully submit that the combination does not suggest storing proper information of a TV and contact information of an Internet site as well as displaying function

information and feature information of the TV on a screen by using the stored contact information and the stored proper information.

For at least the reasons set forth above, applicants respectfully submit that the applied references (applied in the combination set forth in the Office Action) do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter at least for these reasons.

Independent Claim 10

Independent claim 10 also defines patentable subject matter for at least similar reasons. That is, independent claim 10 recites that when a selection is made by a user, transmitting stored proper information of the TV from the TV to a product-related site by using stored contact information of the product-related site stored in advance of the selection by the user. Independent claim 10 also recites receiving menu information corresponding to the TV.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Kikinis and the BMW Website do not teach or suggest these features as they do not relate to transmitting stored proper information of the TV and receiving menu information corresponding to the TV.

Furthermore, Sturgeon and Lee do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 10. That is, Sturgeon, as set forth above, does not transmit stored proper information of a TV from the TV to a product-related site by using stored contact information of the product-related site stored in advance by the user. Also, Sturgeon does not teach or suggest receiving menu information corresponding to the TV. Additionally, Lee does not teach or suggest these missing features of independent claim 10. Lee has no suggestion for transmitting stored proper

information of a TV from the TV to a product related site by using stored contact information of the product related site stored in advance of the selection by the user. Lee does not relate to a TV but rather relates to a computer system. At best, Lee merely discloses that a user may obtain manuals from a computer support server via a personal computer. There is no suggestion for combining Sturgeon and Lee so as to relate to features of proper information of a TV and/or menu information corresponding to the TV.

For at least the reasons set forth above, applicants respectfully submit that the applied references (applied in the combination set forth in the Office Action) do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 10. Thus, independent claim 10 defines patentable subject matter at least for these reasons.

Independent Claim 20

Independent claim 20 also defines patentable subject matter for at least similar reasons. That is, independent claim 20 recites receiving a signal indicating a desire to obtain product-related information, transmitting previously-stored identifying information of a television system to a server in direct response to the received signal and receiving information at the television system and from the server based on the transmitted previously-stored identifying information.

For at least the reasons set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest these features. That is, as set forth above, Kikinis and the BMW Website, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest any type of previously-stored identifying information of a television system. As such, Kikinis and the BMW Website do not teach or suggest transmitting previously-stored identifying information of a television system to a server in direct response to a

received signal. Additionally, Kikinis and the BMW Website, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest receiving information at the television system and from the server based on the transmitted previously stored identifying information.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Sturgeon and Lee do not teach or suggest these features relating to previously-stored identifying information of the television system. More specifically, Sturgeon and Lee do not teach or suggest any type of previously-stored identifying information of a television system. Further, Sturgeon and Lee do not teach or suggest transmitting previously-stored identifying information of a television system to a server in direct response to a received signal. Additionally, Sturgeon and Lee do not teach or suggest receiving information at the television system and from the server based on the transmitted previously stored identifying information.

For at least the reasons set forth above, the applied references (applied in the combinations set forth in the Office Action) do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 20. Thus, independent claim 20 defines patentable subject matter at least for these reasons.

Dependent Claims

Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

Serial No. 09/840,881
Reply to Office Action dated June 30, 2005

Docket No. P-0219

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-13 and 15-26 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, David C. Oren, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



David C. Oren
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DYK:DCO/kah

Date: September 29, 2005

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610